

m

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/753,211	TILEY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher R Buchanan	3627	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Christopher R Buchanan.

(3) Stephen Tiley (appl).

(2) Ken Rice.

(4) Chris Schooster (attorney).

Date of Interview: 26 March 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 12

Identification of prior art discussed: Tsukuda, Chicago Sun-Times article.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.



Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Attorney will send in amendment to claim 1 to include further limitations regarding direct marketing.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


KENNETH RICE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
 3/26/03
Examiner's signature, if required